

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 Case No.: 2:19-cv-00254-JAD-NJK

4 Eric J. Flores,

5 Plaintiff

Order Dismissing Action

6 v.

7 State of Nevada, et al.,

8 Defendants

9
10 Plaintiff Eric J. Flores brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 for events he alleges
11 occurred during his incarceration at High Desert State Prison (“HDSP”).¹ On February 14, 2019,
12 the Court directed Flores to file a fully completed application to proceed *in forma pauperis* or
13 pay the \$400 filing fee.² In a March 6, 2019, order granting an extension of time to file an
14 application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court expressly warned Flores that this case would
15 be dismissed unless he filed the completed application or paid the filing fee by April 18, 2019.³
16 The deadline has passed, and Flores has done nothing.

17 District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of
18 that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.⁴ A
19 court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action,
20 failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.⁵ In determining whether to

21
22 ¹ ECF No. 1-1 (complaint).

23 ² ECF No. 3 (order).

24 ³ ECF No. 5 (order).

25 ⁴ *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

26
27 ⁵ See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with
28 local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to
comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–

1 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with
2 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious
3 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the
4 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the
5 availability of less drastic alternatives.⁶

6 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the
7 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.
8 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury
9 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
10 prosecuting an action.⁷ The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
11 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in
12 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.⁸ Flores was warned that his
13 case would be dismissed if he failed to pay the fee or submit a completed application by April
14 18, 2019.⁹ So, Flores had adequate warning that his failure to pay the fee or submit a completed
15 application would result in this case's dismissal.

16 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** without
17 prejudice based on Flores's failure to pay the fee or submit a completed application in
18 compliance with this Court's March 6, 2019, order; and
19
20

21 41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to
22 keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.
23 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,
1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

24 ⁶ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
25 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

26 ⁷ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

27 ⁸ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

28 ⁹ ECF No. 5 (order).

1 The Clerk of Court is directed to ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS
2 CASE.

3 _____
4 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
5 Dated: May 13, 2019
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28